

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 322 099

SP 032 396

AUTHOR Firestone, William A.; Bader, Beth D.
TITLE Restructuring Teaching: Form, Process, and Outcome.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 18 Apr 90
GRANT G008690011-89
NOTE 65p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 17-20, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bureaucracy; *Career Ladders; Excellence in Education; *Governance; *Organizational Change; Power Structure; Professional Development; Program Development; *Teacher Education Programs; *Teacher Participation

ABSTRACT

Educators have recently become more willing to realign the educational system. One approach is restructuring, which can take many forms. This study looks at three districts that restructured teaching, two with career ladders and one with shared governance. The reforms took two directions--professional and bureaucratic--which had important consequences for the process and outcomes of the restructuring. Many factors were encompassed in the direction taken, including how districts addressed certain dimensions of job and organizational design; i.e., authority and autonomy. Political factors that shaped the direction of development include the shape of the state program; the support of the board; the vision of the superintendent; and the interactions of board, superintendent, teachers and teachers' associations. Where the direction was bureaucratic--imposed from the top down with little or no teacher influence--there was significant teacher resistance, standardization of curriculum and instruction, and negative impacts on teacher motivation. Where the direction was professional--developed locally with significant teacher influence--there was widespread teacher acceptance, significant differentiation in curriculum and instruction, and positive impacts on teacher motivation. Where the direction was mixed--both top down and teacher-influenced design and implementation--results were mixed and difficult to assess.
(Author/JD)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED322099

RESTRUCTURING TEACHING:
FORM, PROCESS, AND OUTCOME

William A. Firestone
Beth D. Bader

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. A. Firestone

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

April 3, 1990

Paper to be presented at the conference of the
American Education Research Association
Boston, MA
April 18, 1990

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

This study is being conducted under a grant furnished by the Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Grant #OERI-G008690011-89. Research reports are issued by CPRE to facilitate the exchange of ideas among policymakers and researchers who share an interest in education policy. The views expressed in the reports are those of individual authors and are not necessarily shared by the U.S. Department of Education, CPRE or its institutional partners.

5P 032 396

ABSTRACT
RESTRUCTURING TEACHING:
FORM, PROCESS, AND OUTCOMES

Educators have recently become more willing to realign the educational system. One approach is restructuring which can take many forms. This study looks at three districts that restructured teaching, two with career ladders and one with shared governance. The reforms took two directions--professional and bureaucratic--which had important consequences for the process and the outcomes of the restructuring. Many factors were encompassed in the direction taken, including how districts addressed certain dimensions of job and organizational design--i.e. authority and autonomy, collegiality, rank and remuneration, task variety, and organizational shape. Political factors that shaped the direction of development include the shape of the state program, the support of the board, the vision of the superintendent, and the interactions of board, superintendent, teachers and teachers' associations.

Where the direction was bureaucratic--imposed from the top down with little or no teacher influence--there were significant teacher resistance, standardization of curriculum and instruction, and negative impacts on teacher motivation. Where the direction was professional--developed locally with significant teacher influence--there was widespread teacher acceptance, significant differentiation in curriculum and instruction, and positive impacts on teacher motivation. Where the direction was mixed--i.e. both top down and teacher-influenced design and implementation--results were mixed and difficult to assess.

**RESTRUCTURING TEACHING:
FORM, PROCESS, AND OUTCOME**

In the last decade, people have been more willing to consider a major realignment of the educational system than in any time since the 1920s. In reports like A Nation Prepared and Time for Results, such influential groups as the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986) and the National Governors' Association (1986) proposed serious restructuring of the nation's schools. The associationst for a variety of governing groups--including the National Governor Association (Cohen, 1988b), the National Association of State Boards of Education (n.d.), and the National School Boards Association (1990)--all advocate restructuring and offer advice to their members on how to proceed.

Still, educators lack guidance on what restructuring looks like and how to get there. According to Kirst (in Olson, 1989, p. 1), "restructuring is a word that means everything and nothing simultaneously." Frank Newman, President of the Education Commission of the States, says, "There's a feeling that we have been marching down the path of restructuring, but without really knowing where we are going or how we get there" (quoted in Walker, 1990, p. 15). This is partly because the term is necessarily so broad. In one definition it encompasses changes in curriculum and instruction, authority and decision making, staff roles, and accountability systems (Cohen, 1989a). Most proposals for restructuring focus on changing the roles of teachers through site-based management (Guthrie, 1986), career ladders (Carnegie Forum, 1986), or other less specific proposals to empower teachers and alter school governance (Olson, 1989), but the forms and purposes of these changes and how to implement them remain unclear.

The discussion of restructuring will remain exhortatory and ambiguous until more concrete examples of restructuring in practice become available. Relatively few districts and states are experimenting with restructuring in a substantial way (Firestone, Fuhrman, & Kirst, 1989). The first reports on these experiments are just beginning to be available (e.g., David, 1989; Malen & Hart, 1987). To advance the dialogue, this paper addresses three tasks. First, it examines the form of restructuring by examining the magnitude and direction of restructuring efforts. Second, it addresses the problem of how to restructure by offering a political perspective on the restructuring process. Finally, it looks at the effects of such efforts on teaching. These tasks are addressed through an examination of three school districts that restructured teaching to varying degrees.

THE STUDY

This study is of three districts that developed programs for restructuring teaching. Districts included in the study were selected in a two-step process. States were selected that had significant policy affecting teaching. Two had a form of career ladder. The third had policies to strengthen the continuing professional development of all teachers and the induction of new ones. Within states, districts were sought that were recognized by knowledgeable state-level persons as actively implementing the policy of interest.

Two additional criteria were applied to rule out alternative hypotheses for successful restructuring. First, since size might affect such efforts and the mean school district enrollment is only 2640 (National Education Association, 1989), districts were chosen with more than 6000 students, where the challenges of putting a new program in place would be greater. Second,

since substantial district wealth and a higher SES clientele might make restructuring easier, districts were sought that at least were more typical on these criteria. The districts selected are described in Table 1. The three programs were quite different.

Mossville was one of a few districts piloting a state-structured career ladder program. The state program created a set of steps so teachers' recognition and remuneration would reflect differential performance. The steps were for Initial Teachers in their first three years of service, level I or professional teachers, and level II teachers whose performance was judged to be more proficient. To move up the steps teachers would be evaluated in class with an instrument that assessed such factors as the use of instructional time, classroom presentation, the maintenance of order, and the monitoring and feedback given students. At the end of three years, teachers who passed the evaluation would receive tenure and be advanced an extra step on the state's teacher salary schedule. When teachers moved up to level II, they again advanced an extra step on the schedule and were eligible for special duties for which they could receive extra pay. The funding for teacher remuneration came from the state.

Desert Flats implemented a very different kind of career ladder. This state policy allocated funds to districts that could be used four ways: to extend the teachers' school year, to provide bonuses for excellent teaching performance, to create a set of levels reflecting teaching performance to which permanent salary increases could be assigned, and/or to permit teachers to complete special tasks for additional remuneration. Districts could design their own salary system and could allocate state funds among the four program

**RESTRUCTURING TEACHING STUDY
TABLE OF CASES**

	SMALLTOWN	DESERT FLATS	MOSSVILLE
PROGRAM DESCRIPTION	Shared governance; increasing teacher involvement in decision making; elaborate communication structure	Career ladder; multi-level job enlargement component, extended year component, merit pay component.	Career ladder; multi-level performance-based pay; some job enlargement
PUPIL POPULATION	6,800	13,100	19,041
PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ¹	\$4,265	\$2,634	\$3,043
MINORITY ENROLLMENT	10%	5%	31%
PERCENT BELOW POVERTY LEVEL	15.2%	25.2%	28.6%
NUMBER OF BOARD INTERVIEWS	9	6	9
NUMBER OF ADMINISTRATOR INTERVIEWS	11	13 ²	14
NUMBER OF TEACHER INTERVIEWS	20	19	21

1. The estimated national quintile of per pupil expenditure that the state each district is in is as follows:

Smalltown - 1
Desert Flats - 5
Mossville - 4

2. As of the completion of this paper, all fieldwork had not been completed. More building administrators and teachers will be interviewed in Desert Flats.

elements as they saw fit, except that no more than half the money could go to extending the year and no less than ten percent was required for merit bonuses. Desert Flats deemphasized the two merit elements and built up the final job enlargement element. Four standard job categories were created:

Lead teachers received even more summer work time and release time and the same salary increase to provide more extensive guidance to teachers, especially new ones, and work on specific building problems.

Curriculum specialists received summer work time, a small salary increase, and limited release time to do building-level curriculum development.

Elementary grade-level coordinators and secondary cluster-coordinators received release time to do district wide curriculum development and training for people in their relevant areas of expertise.

Teachers were chosen for these positions by building-level committees of administrators and teachers after undergoing satisfactory peer and instructional evaluations. The instructional evaluations were locally designed using the basic concept of PET.

Although Smalltown implemented its state's continuing professional development and teacher induction programs, what was important was its own "shared governance" initiative. The centerpiece of its shared governance was two kinds of decision-making bodies. One was a contractual body, the personnel committee, to deal with disputed teacher assignments and transfers; the others, building planning councils and the senate were structured as representative bodies of schools, and were initiated by the board policy of shared governance. These bodies were also to create a set of new positions--Master Teachers and Peer Assistants--who were projected to assist with the curricular and support functions of individual schools. Decisions dealing with operational problem solving at the school level were to be carried out by the building planning councils. Decisions about district-wide issues were to be made by the senate.

In addition, the senate was to create a new teacher evaluation system to improve instruction.

Data Collection

Twenty person-days of field work were conducted at each site. The field work was initially organized around a protocol designed to elicit information on the local implementation process. However, as we became more familiar with each district, attention shifted to understanding the restructuring efforts under way. Data were collected in three ways. First, such documents as district records, school board minutes, newspaper articles, and program descriptions were examined to get information on the district and its restructuring programs. Second, researchers attended meetings of the school board and planning groups, as well as training and working sessions for teachers. Finally, several rounds of intensive interviews of board members, administrators, and teachers as well as outside informants were conducted to reconstruct the history of the restructuring effort and learn about current perceptions of what it means and how it works (see Table 1).

NEW ORGANIZATIONAL FORMS

Efforts to design new organizational structures for teaching face at least two major questions. First, how much change is enough? The thrust of restructuring is in the direction of big changes that are central to organizational operations. According to David (1989, p. 1), "'Restructuring' clearly connotes change of a broader scope than new programs or stiffer requirements." What is not so clear is whether restructuring changes must be revolutionary or if they can be incremental. Consider three levels of change

in the teachers role: 1) doing away with the egg-crate spatial arrangement and assignment of single teachers to classes of students, 2) maintaining the egg-crate structure but blurring the division of labor among teachers, principals, district staff, and superintendents so role boundaries become more indistinct, and 3) maintaining the egg-crate structure and the existing division of labor, but providing mechanisms to allow teachers legitimate influence over decisions about curriculum and school and district operations. All of these are more than new programs; they affect central district operations. Are they all degrees of restructuring or are some restructuring and some not? This is an important issue for observers because there is a long history of reforms in practice falling short of the rhetoric that brought them forth (Ginsberg & Wimpleberg, 1988). To some extent interpretations of the success of restructuring efforts will depend on expectations for the magnitude of change.

The second issue concerns the direction of restructuring. Because restructuring is such an ambiguous concept, it encompasses many visions of how to reform (Elmore, 1990). The reports that provide the vision for restructuring teaching (Carnegie Forum, 1986; Holmes Group, 1986; National Governors' Association, 1986) advocate the professionalization of teaching. There is, however, a countertrend towards bureaucratizing teaching that is apparent in a number of educational reforms (Wise, 1979) including some recent efforts to restructure (Popkewitz & Lind, 1988).

The bureaucratic and professional views of teaching differ in their conceptions of the knowledge base for teaching, and their prescriptions for the control of practice (Elmore, 1990; Weick & McDaniel, 1989). The bureaucratic view of teaching suggests that it is a field with limited uncertainty. The

problems teachers face are readily analyzable, and a finite array of solutions is available. Even if there is no one best way, teaching approaches can be matched to conditions using contingency theories. Bureaucratic constructions are amenable to scientific research so theory can guide practice. The professional view highlights the uncertainty of teaching (Lanier & Sedlak, 1989). That work is seen as a constructive process where problems are ambiguously formed, and judgement and trial-and-error learning must supplement a rich, complex knowledge base to overcome endemic uncertainties (Schon, 1989). The endemic uncertainties of teaching require that professional judgment supplement research-based knowledge.

The general strategies of control in restructuring the teaching profession derive from these views of knowledge. Bureaucracy relies upon supervision and standardization through rules, role differentiation, output controls like tests, and process controls like curricula, and texts (Elmore, 1990). These can be guided by research and developed centrally by those deemed best prepared to interpret that research. In a professional setting, supervision and standardization are considered to constrain the necessary use of judgment. Instead, professionals are socialized to a code of ethics and become committed to the values of their occupation (Selznick, 1957). These professionals then police themselves, and guidance is provided to younger or less knowledgeable practitioners by their older or more experienced colleagues.

Both of these visions of teaching can be embedded in restructuring programs. Which direction a program takes and how big a restructuring effort it is can be assessed by examining it in terms of five dimensions of job and organizational design: authority and autonomy, collegiality, rank and

remuneration, changed tasks, and changed organizational form. These dimensions become more concrete when applied to the three districts examined.

Authority and Autonomy

The change receiving greatest attention in restructuring efforts is in the distribution of formal authority. To some, empowerment, meaning sharing system responsibility with teachers, has become almost synonymous with restructuring. Increasing teacher autonomy and responsibility is consonant with professionalization. If the critical knowledge about teaching resides with teachers and is constructed and reconstructed through the teaching act, they need substantial autonomy to make use of it. Close supervision will constrain teachers' ability to use what they know. This argument extends to curricular and administrative decisions that affect more than single classrooms. Allowing teachers to share responsibility for such decisions ensures that their knowledge will be incorporated into decisions that are made. Finally, influence over decisions increases teachers' ownership of those decisions and commitment to them (Bacharach & Conley, 1989; Rosenholtz, 1985).

From the bureaucratic perspective, teachers' commitment is less important. Moreover, relevant knowledge rests at higher levels of the hierarchy, particularly among district staff. Following the same principle that influence should follow expertise, bureaucratization calls for centralization of school- and district-wide decision making. It also suggests reducing teacher autonomy in the classroom since it is thought less skilled and weakly committed teachers may misapply the principles of effective instruction.

The main thrust of Smalltown's shared governance program was to incorporate teachers into school and district decision making. One procedure

was changed, and three organizational mechanisms were put in place:

- o The presidents of both the teachers' and principals' associations were made permanent members of the cabinet;
- o a personnel committee, consisting of the director of personnel and a designated member of the local education association was created contractually to hear and review transfers, assignments, and teaching schedules;
- o building planning councils were created by policy of the Board to consist of two faculty elected by building staff, and the building administrator all authorized to meet regularly to deal with particular, non-association related, school problems;
- o a 'senate' consisting of the building administrator and one of the two members of the building planning council from each building, to decide on matters of importance to the district. A working sub-group of the senate has developed a teacher evaluation system for the district.

Desert Flats' career ladder expanded teacher authority in three ways.

First, the career ladder itself had a steering committee with an overwhelming majority of teachers elected by teachers. Administrator representation on this committee was limited in the by-laws. The committee reviewed procedures annually in light of both district practice and changing state law and made changes in how the program would work. Second, teachers had considerably more formal influence over curriculum through their roles in the curriculum development process. They did a great deal to shape what was taught throughout the district. Finally, teachers shared influence with administrators in deciding who would hold career ladder positions. Lead teachers, for instance, were chosen jointly by the principal and two teachers elected for the purpose. Formally, the principal must be included in a majority decision on career ladder positions. Informally, however, principals recounted decisions where they were overruled by teachers.

In contrast to these two programs, Mossville's career ladder reduced

teacher authority. The career ladder itself was to be run by a steering committee that originally had a minority of teachers appointed by administrators; over time many of these teachers were promoted to other administrative and specialist positions but did not lose their seats. Moreover, it appears that most decisions were made largely by the Assistant Superintendent for Personnel who ran the program. There was also a second committee with a majority of teachers on it, but it served only as a means to funnel information to teachers, not to make decisions. The other factor affecting teacher authority was the evaluation system. This system specified a certain style of teaching that was built into evaluation criteria. While the impact of this system was limited because teachers were only observed four times per year, teachers changed their teaching to fit the criteria. Teachers also feared that evaluators could use the system to play favorites and questioned why some teachers made level II and others did not. Finally, there was also some effect on what teachers taught:

If a kid walks in with some tadpoles, teachers feel if the OE comes in, she'll say you're not supposed to teach tadpoles. You're supposed to teach light. That's what's in the lesson plan.

Collegiality

Teaching is currently an isolated field. Teachers rarely have a chance to discuss their work with other adults and have even fewer opportunities to observe and be observed by their peers (Johnson, 1989). Lack of opportunities for collegial interaction is a barrier to professionalism but not relevant from the bureaucratic perspective. The professional perspective suggests that fellow teachers are an important stimulus for growth and development, especially in the judgement required for reflective practice (Shulman, 1989).

DRAFT

April 3, 1990

Collaborative interaction facilitates the development and implementation of new practices (Little, 1982). Moreover, it can promote commitment to teaching. When an on-the-job peer group interacts regularly and enjoys its work, the group provides support for all its members (Mowday, Steers & Porter, 1982).

These restructuring programs provided three opportunities for peer interaction: training situations, curriculum development, and governance activities. Desert Flats provided the greatest amount of collegial interaction. Its cluster coordinators, and grade level coordinators developed new materials and provided the training to help teachers use those materials. Teachers with district-wide career ladder ranks were the most frequent presenters at district-wide inservice days. Lead teachers and curriculum experts played a similar role at school inservice days. Lead teachers in particular had release time to work with individual teachers, whether beginners or more experienced, who needed assistance. All first year teachers were assigned to a lead teacher responsible for mentoring, instructional modeling, and for completing at least one clinical supervision. (This supervision session did not get entered into the beginning teacher's file.) In addition, when principals found teachers who needed help during formal and informal observations, they recommended those teachers to the lead teachers.

The career ladder steering committee also provided opportunities for collegial interaction. During the year of our observation, the task force created a research committee to consider modifying the existing system of rotating positions to make them permanent assignments.

Smalltown's opportunities for interaction usually fell into the governance sphere. The building planning councils and the senate provided new settings

DRAFT

April 3, 1990

for interaction although the district-wide settings were carefully orchestrated by the superintendent, and at times teachers' chances to talk were limited. After the first year, a peer assistance council was initiated. Teachers on the council were available to help any teacher who wanted help in improving teaching.

Collegial interaction was least evident in Mossville. There the governance settings either had few teachers or were occasions where interaction was directed by the district administration. The career ladder did extend training opportunities considerably, but this training was usually provided by individuals assigned to the central office. While these people were former teachers, they were not perceived as teachers by the rest of the staff. Moreover, the training agenda was set more unilaterally by the district administration and not structured to facilitate sharing among teachers.

Rank and Remuneration

Rank and remuneration are important to both the professional and bureaucratic perspective, but in different ways. Professionalization is enhanced by a well-defined occupational hierarchy that provides incentives for experienced teachers to stay in the field and provides additional rewards for knowledgeable performance (Elmore, 1990). Promotion through the hierarchy should be controlled by teachers themselves as knowledgeable professionals who are best placed to assess the quality of performance. Moreover, insofar as opportunities for influence and to provide training and assistance are distributed differentially according to one's knowledge, the system of ranks and remuneration should provide the time required for those opportunities. Thus, higher ranked teachers might have the greatest release time from regular

DRAFT

April 3, 1990

teaching assignments. The Carnegie Forum's (1986) treatment of career ladders reflects this conception.

The bureaucratic perspective also employs rank and remuneration as incentives, but the emphasis is more on compliance. Rewards should be allocated by administrators in proportion to conformity to standardized expectations. Differentiation among teachers is less important than in the professional perspective because the crucial difference in knowledge is not among teachers but between teachers and staff and line administrators. Thus, salary scales and career ladders can be flatter than in more professionalized fields like higher education.

The Mossville career ladder provided remuneration and, to a lesser extent, recognition to teachers. Moving up a career ladder level could add as much as ten percent to one's salary. The steps themselves were supposed to denote greater prestige, but they did not have that effect. As one teacher explained, "If you were respected last year, adding level II won't make a difference." There appeared to be resentment among teachers that some teachers were labelled as more proficient than others. Promotion of the ladder was controlled by principals and district staff who evaluated teacher performance.

Desert Flats' career ladder also provided increased remuneration. Lead teachers were given twenty-six days of summer work at their daily rate for special assignments, a fourteen percent increase. These teachers and those in other ranks received an additional stipend of about \$1100 for work conducted during the school year. By gearing positions to differentiated tasks rather than evaluated ability, the Desert Flats ladder played down status differences. In fact, these positions had a legitimation that was not present in Mossville

because teachers appreciated the additional work that lead teachers and their colleagues performed and there were fewer arguments about the fairness of the selection procedure. Promotion in Desert Flats was decided jointly by teachers and administrators. The limitation to the Desert Flats remuneration policy was that positions were not organized as a stable sequence of stages. Instead, teachers rotated in and out of positions. Also, it was not necessary before becoming a lead teacher.

Smalltown had the least differentiation. The master teacher position was largely honorific. Teachers became master teachers through a complex election process where agreement was needed across three roles: teachers, principals, and central office administrators. Neither master teachers nor those on the peer assistance council were paid for their services.

Task Variety

Task variety is important to the professional vision, but not the bureaucratic one. From the professional view, teachers can grow into new tasks as they become more knowledgeable. Task variety also facilitates teacher commitment. Currently, teachers do roughly the same work when they start out as when they retire (Lortie, 1975). As a result, they often reach their peak efficiency in their fifth year after which boredom sets in and commitment declines (Rosenholtz, 1985). Task variety can help overcome this problem.

Desert Flats provided the greatest task variety through its job enlargement program. Teachers became much more actively involved in activities for which a very few had volunteered in the past. Some kinds of curriculum development happened that simply had not been possible before. Several teachers, for instance, pointed to a new district art curriculum that had been

DRAFT

April 3, 1990

developed through the job enlargement program but with help additional from an outside grant. Curriculum materials were developed in other areas as well. In addition, teachers became much more involved in training other teachers. Approximately 40 percent of the districts' teachers had job enlargement positions in any given year.

Mossville and Smalltown did much less to expand teachers' tasks. Mossville's level II teachers were essentially classroom teachers with only a few different responsibilities than their level I colleagues. The level I teachers did the same things as the initial status teachers except that fewer supports and learning opportunities were offered. Level II teachers were eligible for extra-pay-for-extra-work assignments, but there were many fewer of these assignments than existed in Desert Flats. Moreover, many of the jobs were not as new to the system. Many of these jobs were as department chair, an already existing position. Smalltown created new governance positions but these were not paid, and the release time provided was limited and dependent on building administrator discretion and participatory inclination. Service on this council may have created as much strain as task variety. Other new positions were as peer assistants. But this participation was more dependent on other teachers' desires for assistance and far less structured than similar positions in Desert Flats. Many Smalltown teachers were involved through self-selection, but time and energy requirement at the time of the study was much less.

Organizational Shape

The preceding characteristics referred to job design more than the overall form of the organization, but restructuring can have implications for the

DRAFT

April 3, 1990

latter as well. Some parts of the organization can grow at a greater rate than others. Mintzberg (1983) identifies five parts of an organization: the operating core of workers who do the main production; middle management; the strategic apex of top leaders; the support staff of bus drivers, cafeteria workers, and others who make it possible to get the core work done; and the technostructure of staff analysts who standardize work processes. He also identifies different types of organizations depending on which parts of the organization dominate. Three types are especially important for these considerations. The simple structure is coordinated by the direct supervision of workers, and its key element is the strategic apex that supervises and makes major decisions. The machine bureaucracy is coordinated through standardization of work processes, and the technostructure is the key element. Both of these are variations on the bureaucratic theme. Mintzberg's professional organization is standardized through training, and the operating core of professional workers is the key element.

While these districts do not fit Mintzberg's organizational types, they do differ in their areas of expansion, thus clarifying developmental tendencies. Growth in Desert Flats took place in the operating core, not by hiring new teachers but by buying more of their time for curriculum development and training. This suggests development in a professional direction. Growth in Mossville took place in the central office. A new personnel category was created: the observer-evaluator. These teachers on temporary assignment to the central office at a supervisor's pay were primarily responsible for helping principals evaluate teachers. In effect they contributed to standardization of teaching through the evaluation system. In addition they trained teachers on

DRAFT

April 3, 1990

how to comply with the evaluation system, and one person was assigned the task of ensuring inter-rater reliability among evaluators. The observer-evaluators were overseen by a career ladder director. Since the observer-evaluator's responsibility was for standardizing performance, growth in Mossville was in the technostucture, suggesting movement in the direction of the machine bureaucracy. No comparable growth was noted in Smalltown. Teachers were expected to participate in the new governance system and teacher support system voluntarily so the limits to possible expansion were greater than in Desert Flats.

This comparison of the three districts suggests that Desert Flats went the farthest in the professional direction. It increased teacher authority in a number of areas, built collegiality, added task variety, and expanded its operating core. There was some variation in remuneration and rank, but a stable sequence of career stages was not created. Smalltown's steps in the professional direction were smaller, emphasizing the expansion of teacher authority. Opportunities for collegial assistance were more vestigial and voluntary than in Desert Flats. By contrast, Mossville's career ladder took a bureaucratic direction. Teachers' authority over school and district decisions was not expanded, and classroom autonomy was reduced. The opportunities for collegial interaction and task variety were limited, and expansion took place in the technostucture. A stable sequence of career stages was created but the increased remuneration was small, and opportunities for advancement were controlled strictly by the administration. The career ladder functioned largely as a way to reward compliance with the evaluation criteria.

Roughly speaking, the projects fall into two levels of magnitude.

Smalltown's restructuring was more modest than those of Mossville and Desert Flats. Just how big even the larger changes are depends on one's viewpoint. In comparison to discussions of what restructuring should accomplish, these districts engaged in modest, not radical restructuring. The basic division of labor between teachers and administrators remained intact, although teachers' influence did increase in Smalltown and Desert Flats and their autonomy declined somewhat in Mossville. The career ladders did provide differential incentives for teachers, but the fundamental equity among teachers remained in place. The Mossville career ladder standardized instructional practice somewhat, but variation was still quite noticeable.

In practice reforms rarely live up to the expectations created for them (Ginsberg & Wimpelberg, 1987); there are systematic patterns of watering down (Malen & Hart, 1987). Therefore, it is important to know how these districts fared compared to others. Although good data for such comparisons are lacking, it appears that these districts are doing a fair amount. Although these districts generally have restructured less than most of those described by David (1989), all of them have reputations in their states as progressive restructurors. Some have received national publicity for their efforts. Mossville and Desert Flats have taken steps that are not common for the country while it is not appropriate to make a final judgement on Smalltown because of the slow, incremental process being employed (see below).

THE PROCESS OF RESTRUCTURING

Why were these districts active restructurors, and why did two move in a professional direction and one in a bureaucratic one? Answers to these questions come from an examination of the process of restructuring. A

April 3, 1990

political perspective helps interpret what happened. Political metaphors are often used in organizational research (Morgan, 1986). In education, political perspectives have been used to clarify relationships between superintendents and school boards (Burlingame, 1988) and principals and teachers (Blase, 1989) as well as for labor relations (Bacharach & Mitchell, 1981), and innovation processes (Nadler, 1987). For this purpose, they are especially useful because they examine how structures affect organizational process but also how process can change structure (Ranson, Hinings, & Greenwood, 1980). They share a view of the organization and its surrounding environment as a set of interacting entities that pursue their individual interests (Bacharach & Lawler, 1980; Baldrige, 1970).

The political perspective has not been refined to the point of suggesting hypotheses about restructuring. According to Bacharach and Mitchell (1987), however, it makes the following assumptions:

1. Formal elements of the organization and its environment establish a set of subsystems identified by functions, each with its own rights, responsibilities, methods of decision making, and constraints.
2. Members of a subsystem may organize into a group when they share interests based on those functions, rights, and responsibilities.
3. It is in the individual's interest to form groups and for groups to create coalitions because such entities have greater influence over collective decisions than individuals.
4. Groups and coalitions use their influence and authority to pursue their interests as decisions are made.
5. While the array of groups and coalitions and their interests and influence may be roughly determined for a kind of organization, the specifics are established historically in each organization.

The specific groups that form and players that compete and create coalitions depend on the structure and history of the organization and the specifics of

April 3, 1990

the issues. In these districts the magnitude of the restructuring effort results from the interplay of the state, the board, the top administration, and the teachers.

To trace this interplay, it is first necessary to examine how the state contributed to both the magnitude and direction of each restructuring effort. Next the relationship between the superintendent and the board will be traced as it affected the magnitude of the change effort. Finally, the interplay among the administration, staff, and board will be described as it affected the direction of the change effort.

The State: Magnitude and Direction

The states' contribution to the magnitude of these restructuring efforts was straightforward; it provided money and a framework. Both career ladders provided funds to reward teachers and create new formal positions within the district. Smalltown managed to use shared governance to fulfill its requirements with the state staff development legislation, and use the state to get regional notoriety for its efforts. The chief state school officer attended the announcement of the new teacher contract with the key elements of shared governance and commented favorably on the idea. However, it simply lacked the money to put in place the more extensive operations found in both other districts.

With money comes constraints, however. The two career ladder programs shaped the local political process. For instance, the extent to which local discretion and teacher influence was possible was determined by the specificity of the legislation. Mossville responded to highly restrictive legislation that limited the district's choice in how to proceed. By contrast, the state

April 3, 1990

legislation that initiated Desert Flats' career ladder was much more open-ended, giving districts broad guidelines within which to operate and requiring teacher and parent participation on the local career ladder design. While some districts did not include teachers actively in the planning, the legislation gave teachers license to participate in Desert Flats.

Legislation also set the basic direction for reform. This was especially clear in Mossville where state legislation specified:

- o the steps in the career ladder
- o criteria for advancement up the ladder in the form of the evaluation scheme to be used
- o who would do the evaluation, (including the number of observer-evaluators since the state supported these positions), and
- o the rough shape of the appeals procedure.

Desert Flats' legislation did not encourage the professional direction taken, but permitted it. That legislation specified four categories for expenditure, and set the maximums and minimums for expenditures in each category, but allowed the district to determine its own emphasis by how funds were allocated to categories. Desert Flats had the option to stress job enlargement at the expense of merit pay (although state program monitors believed that the district deemphasized merit pay more than the law permitted). The district was also allowed to develop its own evaluation scheme.

State policy can also be shaped by the political work of local actors (Fuhrman, Clune & Elmore, 1988), and these districts did influence the legislation to which they responded. In Mossville's state, Dr. Smith, the assistant superintendent in charge of the career ladder, was active on the state steering committee that set policy, and she was recognized as highly

April 3, 1990

influential. The state language on the appeals procedure reflected her interest since appeals were such a prominent part of the program in Mossville. Dr. Wise, the innovative superintendent in Desert Flats, was credited by many as the person who shaped the original career ladder legislation. Although he worked with a group of other superintendents and deans, he was the point person.

District. Superintendent and The Magnitude of Change

Cuban (1989) suggests that superintendents "lead" restructuring efforts when an enlightened school board senses an educational crisis. His view is that board members' sense of crisis triggers restructuring and that its continuation depends upon their understanding and support. These three cases suggest some modifications to his analysis. The relationship between board and superintendent is clarified through examination of the triggers for hiring innovative superintendents and starting the restructuring projects, board understanding of the projects, and local financial support for restructuring.

Superintendent Hiring. The triggers for hiring a new superintendent and for the restructuring effort are quite different. In two cases the superintendent's hiring was a response to the board's deep distress, although in both cases it stemmed from events that happened well before that person was hired. Smalltown's history most approximated a crisis. In the early 1970s, the state legalized collective bargaining for public employees. Smalltown's board originally tried to break its new union. Negotiations were acrimonious, including a fist fight at a board meeting. Strikes were common. By the early 1980s, attention shifted to financial constraints. The district's industrial

April 3, 1990

base was crumbling, expenses were climbing, and the board had to make several large, unpopular millage increases. Program cuts were equally unpopular. In 1984 the board's decision to terminate driver-training prompted a massive community outcry. That year, the board looked for a new superintendent. Meaningful inclusion of teachers on the search committee for the first time is an indication that one agenda was to reduce labor-management conflict. Another was to control the fiscal problem.

Mossville's story begins with a desegregation suit that led to extensive rioting in the city and schools in the early 1970s. The resulting court-mandated bussing plan was opposed by white parents. Bussing problems and plant deterioration created a need for a new building program that the current superintendent could not manage. Meanwhile, one response to the disorder following the desegregation suit was the introduction of "Mickey Mouse" courses to keep the peace. Somewhat earlier, the community lost its single largest employer. It initiated a program to bring in new business. The outsiders coming with these new companies created a demand for a more rigorous program, especially for more talented academic students. In 1981 when the board had the opportunity to hire a new superintendent, its first concern was to find someone who could carry out a building program, but it also wanted someone who could modernize the district's general approach. This included improving student learning and tightening up personnel procedures to avoid favoritism.

The disruption and discontent apparent in Smalltown and Mossville was much less present in Desert Flats. That district had had two superintendents in thirty-five years, both promoted from within. Teachers were left on their own to teach as they saw fit without the benefit of more than minimal curricular

April 3, 1990

guidance or staff development. There were many stories of the "superintendent's boys" network that had arisen out of the status quo. Most board members in the early 1980s were employees of the large university in the city. The consensus was that the district was stagnating and could do better. To that end, they too sought an outside superintendent.

These stories suggest two conclusions: that boards hired superintendents who became instrumental in restructuring efforts because they were unhappy with the current situation, but the extent of unhappiness varied. Only Smalltown faced a true crisis. The sources of discontent were not always addressed by restructuring. Mossville's board was most concerned about its plant, although rationalizing personnel management was a concern. Smalltown's financial crisis was more important than labor-management harmony.

Impetus to Restructure. The boards were less directly involved in starting restructuring. By the time Smalltown began shared governance, its immediate financial crises had passed. The new superintendent, Dr. Brahmin, had initiated five-year contracts with teachers to build stability. Near the middle of the first long contract, he began discussions with the local association leadership and the regional NEA representative serving those teachers. Shared governance was initiated through those discussions and later brought to the board in time to prepare that group for the new idea which was formalized through an extension of the teachers' contract.

In Mossville, Dr. O'Brien, the new superintendent took a number of steps to respond to board concerns. Some were to systematize the evaluation of principals and teachers and to use the new system to motivate principals to avoid giving tenure to incompetent teachers. Unlike his predecessor, Dr.

April 3, 1990

O'Brien also encouraged his administrative staff to take advantage of state initiatives. The district volunteered to pilot the new state teacher evaluation system and later the pilot career ladder. While the proposals for these efforts were written by Dr. Smith, the assistant superintendent for personnel who also ran them, Dr. O'Brien encouraged efforts that fit his agenda for developing more "data-based" approaches to evaluation. The board had to approve the proposals, but the initiative is probably best placed with Dr. Smith.

Desert Flats' superintendent, Dr. Wise, initiated several changes in curriculum and instruction. One was a new personnel evaluation system. The career ladder idea came out of discussions Dr. Wise had with a select group of deans of schools of education and superintendents of other districts around the state. He was instrumental in pushing the bill through the legislature. He devised a scheme to get local financial support by moving to year-round schools and redirecting funds that would otherwise be needed for a building program to support teachers. Again the board had to approve the ideas, but the initiation came from the administration.

Understanding and Support for Restructuring. Board members generally understood the main points of the restructuring programs although their evaluations of those programs sometimes differed from those of the administrators in charge. When asked to explain the Mossville career ladder, one board member closely connected with the business world said:

The teachers' association was very anti. What worked for us was ... we chose 2 or 3 representatives from the association so they spoke for career development, not for the union....Teachers didn't understand that evaluation regardless of career development. Teachers resented evaluation...I've been associated with industry,... and evaluation is a

April 3, 1990

regular part of life there.

Others spoke from their own experience in ways suggesting that they understood the main features of the program but evaluated them somewhat differently from district leaders:

As a teacher, there were some things I liked. It gave us training to show us different ways to teach...But we all had to do the same thing...If I were a student going through something like that 6 times it would be boring for the kids.

It's an effort to identify good teaching and then reward it...A positive outgrowth of [career ladder] was the mixing of high school, middle school, and elementary teachers in meetings and letting each see the others' difficulties.

In Desert Flats, even though the board members interviewed were mostly new, they knew the district's position on the career ladder and had an opinion on its success:

[Desert Flats'] is successful. It is designed to reward teachers who go the extra mile -- not for what you've always been doing. It's an opportunity to expand teaching skills.

It works well. There are no complaints. Some principals have said it is going well...It has improved the quality of teaching at the elementary level.

Desert Flats board members also knew more details about the program.

Smalltown's board members knew the philosophy of shared governance:

It is nothing in and of itself, but with leadership there is more sharing, a sharing of the decision level. The last discussion and policy remain at the board. We have overall responsibility, but day-to-day decisions are more appropriately made back at the building... It gives linkage between the classroom teachers and [the superintendent].

It's a program for making the system stand out as a quality school district...He [the superintendent] wanted us all to pursue concrete actions for quality schools.

In all three districts, the board's support for the local restructuring effort depended on more than its understanding of that program. General

April 3, 1990

confidence in the superintendent was also an issue. Dr. Brahmin was careful to maintain the Smalltown board's support. He did so partly by moving slowly with shared governance and handling it so the district (including the board) received a great deal of good publicity. Perhaps more important, he got the budget situation under control and reduced millage increases from five and six to one per year. This was partly because several new homebuilding projects raised the tax base but also because he changed the budget planning cycle to start it earlier and get more board input into early formative stages.

By contrast Dr. O'Brien alienated Mossville's board over an eight-year period. In the beginning, the board supported their new superintendent:

When the board is unhappy, they meet more and longer. When they trust and agree with the administration they can meet less. After [O'Brien] came they had one meeting per month.

The career ladder created difficult situations for the board to deal with (see below). Still, the board faced more heated conflicts related to desegregation. Twice during the superintendent's tenure he changed the school bussing plan to maintain an even distribution of minority students among schools. He also expanded the district's gifted program--at some expense to the district--to include more minority students. This change reduced services to those conventionally identified as gifted whose parents opposed the superintendent's changes. Both the bussing program and the gifted and talented program were major issues in the school board elections of 1988; the career ladder was not.

Between 1981 and 1989, six of the seven members who hired the superintendent left the board, most in 1989. Over that time several became increasingly disenchanted with Dr. O'Brien but found themselves unable to

April 3, 1990

modify policy. One said, "Educational administration isn't accountable. Maybe the board can fire the superintendent, but he's not really accountable." The board's support for the program waned, but they did not abolish it. Instead, in the fall of 1989, the board chose not to renew Dr. O'Brien's contract. Even then, the career ladder was continued and decisions about what to do with it were left for the subsequent superintendent.

These examples suggest that often the board's support is as much for an administration in general as for specific programs. Smalltown's board appreciated Dr. Brahmin's handling of the budget as much as shared governance. Mossville's was more moved by equity issues than the career ladder. Moreover, that board did not seek to substantially change the career ladder. When things became difficult, the board looked for a new superintendent to address several difficult problems it faced.

Board Financial Support. One concrete way in which school boards support superintendents' programs is by funding them at or above the level requested. In Smalltown, the Board agreed to every contract and the salary increases contained in them that Dr. Brahmin brought to them. There were no public conflicts over annual budgets, and board members repeatedly stated their satisfaction with both the shared governance program and the labor peace that has resulted. Their agreement to open up the five-year contract to consider salary increases two years before the contract expired indicated their support for their superintendent's programs.

In Desert Flats, because the state did not fund the career ladder fully, Dr. Wise had to find local funding for his ambitious vision of career ladder. District enrollments were growing so rapidly that new buildings appeared

April 3, 1990

necessary. Instead, he proposed to go to a year-round schools program, use the money saved to fund the career ladder, and promise not to raise property taxes for five years. The board allowed Dr. Wise to take his initiative to the public, and it passed. Again we find support for the superintendent's programs.

In Mossville, the state provided funding for the pilot career ladder which the board endorsed. While it did not offer to find more money to supplement what the state sent, Dr. O'Brien did not ask for more. Other programs he submitted, however, were generally supported at the funding levels he requested. None of the programs would have succeeded without board support, but a willingness to provide funds added an extra measure of affirmation in Smalltown and Desert Flats.

Teachers. Board. Superintendent and The Direction of Change

Restructuring efforts often involve new alliances and relationships in school districts (David, 1989). The newest of these involve teachers. Teachers' associations have been instrumental in restructuring changes in Miami and Rochester (David, 1989), but they have also opposed restructuring efforts in other places. According to Johnson, (1990) reforms that have threatened egalitarian norms and been imposed from the top down have not worked, while those arrived at collaboratively with significant teacher representation have been more successful.

Administrator/teacher alliance-building took place in Smalltown and Desert Flats, but not in Mossville. There, teachers were involved in the early planning of the career ladder, but as the program moved towards implementation, teachers' formal role was reduced. When the program began, it included two

April 3, 1990

consultation mechanisms. A career ladder council had one or two representatives from each school in the district. According to one top administrator, "The first year, [the career ladder council] was a bitch session. Now we funnel information to them." The [steering committee] is supposed to make major policy decisions about the career ladder, but it is seen as having "so broad a spectrum that the committee is unworkable." To the extent that it made decisions, teachers complained that their representatives on the steering committee had largely been promoted to other administrative and supervisory positions so they were underrepresented. There was also belief that Dr. Smith, the assistant superintendent in charge of the program, really made the important decisions. Thus, teacher participation was largely "mock participation" (Firestone, 1977). Teachers had one more channel of influence but not for collective decisions. If they were denied promotion to Levels I or II, they could appeal the decision through a two step process: first to an appeals panel picked jointly by the principal and teacher in question, and then to the board. In two cases where teachers were denied promotions at all stages and believed they were being penalized for their teachers' association activities, they sued the district.

Teachers also communicated their discontent with the career ladder to the school board more directly, especially during the first two years of the project. On several occasions, teachers packed school board meetings to complain about the career ladder. This step was taken with considerable trepidation. When the local TV station set up cameras to cover one such meeting, teachers walked out. The meetings only proceeded when TV coverage was limited and Drs. O'Brien and Smith were denied access to the meetings. While

April 3, 1990

the board heard teachers out, no formal action was taken. Indeed there is no indication that these meetings changed the career ladder in any way. Teacher opposition to the program did undermine the board's general support for the superintendent, however. By 1989, three of the seven board members were former teachers. One had experienced the career ladder directly, and all three had numerous personal ties to teachers. The earlier public protests and ongoing private complaints contributed to the decision to not renew Dr. O'Brien's contract.

Reform efforts in Desert Flats began in a similar manner to Mossville, but took an important turn. Dr. Wise arrived with many ideas about making principals instructional leaders, introducing a Madeline Hunter approach to instruction, and otherwise changing how teaching took place. In his own words, "I was working on programs and not cultivating relations or recognizing teachers for the good things they did." Teachers became extremely unhappy and communicated their concern to the board. Matters came to a head at a teachers' association meeting with the superintendent and other administrators present. One member moved that the association have a vote of no confidence in Dr. Wise.

While the motion was never brought to a vote, the point was made. Information about the event got back to the board who directed Dr. Wise to cultivate more staff support for his ideas. When he began planning the career ladder, he used a committee that he chaired with one teacher from each building plus a representative from the local teachers' association. Moreover, teachers were listened to. Dr. Wise originally conceived of the career ladder as replacing the salary schedule based on education and years of experience with a merit-based promotion system. When teachers opposed the system and generally

April 3, 1990

pushed to deemphasize merit-based decisions in favor of job enlargement schemes based on joint teacher-administrator decisions, he agreed.

The career ladder is still overseen by the same teacher committee although a steering committee with fewer members develops proposals for the committee to review. Each year as the state changes the career ladder legislation or its funding or as internal problems are identified, the committee modifies the program accordingly.

One difference in the development of the two programs is in the role of the number two administrator to the superintendent. In Mossville, Dr. Smith controlled the career ladder. She was seen by some teachers to be as much a part of the problem as Dr. O'Brien. In Desert Flats, Dr. Friendly, the assistant superintendent, helped Dr. Wise build relations with the staff. The consensus is that, as one board member put it:

Dr. Wise wouldn't have survived without Dr. Friendly. Dr. Wise was innovative and impatient, and educational systems are conservative. He had important directions to move us in, but he went too fast.... Dr. Friendly is a touching, warm guy. People feel he's on their side. His nurturing and massaging kept it viable.

The story in Smalltown is quite different. As soon as Dr. Brahmin took office, he began reaching out to teachers. He and association leaders began having private conversations getting to know each other and their agendas better. Dr. Brahmin also began inviting teachers into his office for long, open-ended interviews on their view of the district and its history. The first five-year contract was negotiated with no strike or major conflict. After that contract was signed, Dr. Brahmin began a series of private conversations with the regional representative of the state NEA chapter through which the idea of shared governance was initiated. Gradually as a consensus began to emerge,

April 3, 1990

local association leaders and the board were brought into the conversations. The process was highly consultative among a limited number of people. By the time the agreement was worked out the association leaders were committed to it and helped sell it to their members.

As the district began implementing the new plan, the association leaders played a role similar to that of Dr. Friendly in Desert Flats. Teachers were generally suspicious of the new procedures, partly because of the district's past history but also because they were complicated. Two said:

Nobody understands it. This is an effort so not all decisions will come from the top. Teachers will be involved in policy making...I'm not making any judgement on it yet. It's too early. People have said its great and that it won't work. After 28 years I've learned to wait.

It was and is nebulous. No one has a hold on what it is. [The principal] said it would afford teachers the opportunity to be in on all aspects of running the school.

The association leaders found themselves trying to sell the new plan to teachers without seeming to become too close to the administration. For example, at a shared governance meeting of the teachers who were on individual school planning councils, the NEA UniServ representative for Smalldown sorted the comments of people into what he called "gripes" -- such as problems in the elementary school day, equipment problems, dusty chalk, etc. --and "concerns" -- the more significant issues that shared governance was designed to meet. He challenged everyone that Brahmin had to take care of the gripes so that shared governance could deal with the concerns -- the more substantive things that would improve the district's programs. His presence at many of the discussion meetings served both as protection for the teachers, and as a support for the program.

The whole thrust of shared governance was to make district decision-making

April 3, 1990

more open to teachers and principals. This was done partly by the new decision making bodies -- the senate, the personnel committee, and the building planning councils -- but in other ways as well. For instance, the cabinet meetings were opened up to the presidents of the teachers' and principals' association as well as top district administrators. At the meetings, these presidents talked more than the assistant superintendents.

To summarize, reforms in Mossville and Desert Flats generated teacher opposition that was communicated to the board. In Desert Flats the superintendent included teachers more in decision-making which turned the restructuring effort in a professional direction. The superintendent in Mossville resisted pressures to change course and continued with his bureaucratic reform. In both cases, the direction taken was reinforced by the number two administrator. Smalltowns' reform history was much more consultative. By bringing the association into the decision-making loop, its leadership took on some of the bridge-building functions that Desert Flats' number two administrator did. Here too, teacher involvement moved the reform in its professional direction.

Factors Affecting Alliance Building

To understand why alliances developed the way they did in each district, one must know more about the position of the teachers' association and the orientations of the superintendent.

The Teachers' Association. Teachers' associations differ in their access to district decision-making processes depending on both the legal arrangements for collective bargaining and historical and cultural factors. Mossville's

April 3, 1990

associations were least included in decision making. That state had a statewide salary structure determined periodically by the legislature. Raising teachers' salaries depended more on statewide action in general and lobbying in particular than anything the local association did. As a result, the local branch of the state NEA association was relatively weak. Moreover, there were still vestiges of the pre-union orientation in the local association. Both teachers and administrators belonged. What could have been a sign of teacher-management cooperation instead seemed to signal more of a passive stance on the association's part. The NEA president said, "We're not like a union. We don't bargain. If I want something, I go to Dr. O'Brien and Dr. Smith. Not a lot is refused." On the other hand, in most specific instances she mentioned--for instance an effort to move up the date for starting school--the association was unable to get what it wanted.

The passive role of the NEA affiliate frustrated a small number of teachers who joined with the AFT, but by far the bulk of teachers stayed with the NEA. At board meetings the AFT president regularly made a point of appearing and speaking on issues, but neither unit was part of the regular decision-making apparatus.

Desert Flats' association bargained with the local board for salaries. Collective bargaining in the state is optional at the district level, so Desert Flats' use of collective bargaining is important in considerations about Association access to the decision making. As well, there is no law prohibiting strikes of public employees in the state. At the same time, Desert Flats was more open than Mossville to allowing administrators to join the association. Dr. Friendly continued to belong even after he became

April 3, 1990

superintendent, and was sympathetic to teachers' desire to strike if the state did not give them a salary increase. In effect, the association was part of the decision-making apparatus through formal arrangements and local norms that called for consulting with it as decisions were made.

Smalltown negotiated with its association in a state that also allowed teachers' strikes, but in contrast to Desert Flats, the district had a history of extremely acrimonious labor relations. When Dr. Brahmin arrived in Smalltown, relations between the board and the association were polarized, but both sides wanted peace. Moreover, the association was a strong entity, well organized to advance its own interests. It had in effect forced itself into the decision-making apparatus, and the superintendent had to deal with it. However, Dr. Brahmin elected to use an inclusive rather than a confrontive strategy, thereby changing the nature of Association inclusion in the decision-making process.

Superintendent Orientations. Cuban (1989) suggests that another prerequisite for a superintendent to lead a restructuring effort is vision. He emphasizes that the superintendent must either share the board's vision or persuade the board to share his. Our observations indicate that the board gives the superintendent considerably more latitude to generate a vision than Cuban believes, but that the importance of that vision will depend on the three-way interaction among superintendent, board, and staff. Moreover, that vision has two parts, namely what should be changed (content) and how to get there (process). In two of the three districts, there is great congruence between the superintendent's vision and the direction the restructuring effort took. In the third, the superintendent's vision was modified by staff

April 3, 1990

pressures communicated to the board.

In Mossville, Dr. O'Brien's process vision supported centralization of control. His view emphasized the kind of central direction by experts associated with reformist superintendents at the turn of the century (Tyack, 1974):

My attitude is you hired me to run this railroad. I know how. If you don't like it, get rid of me. I must deal with 20,000 students, 38,000 parents, 140,000 people and five political entities. I can't tell the board everything that happened.

This attitude led him to delegate tasks (sometimes broad ones) to specific individuals, as he delegated the career ladder operation to Dr. Smith, and give them considerable leeway as long as those individuals met his expectations. This vision did not encourage building support in constituencies. As he explained,

I put people into two categories: strong and weak. The strong ones like me. The weak ones don't. I don't like to mess around too long with the weak ones.

In fact he did not work on building support. Board members complained that he was uncommunicative and teachers said he was hard to reach and unresponsive. Thus, his process vision contributed to the failure to include teachers in the planning and management of the career ladder.

His content vision took a technocratic direction. He emphasized how various reference or constituency groups wanted "accountability."

During my interview [for the job], the themes were accountability and achievement.

Threaded through [the state reforms] was accountability. Business and industry want to bring in foreign industry. So accountability is important. The state is setting up a centralized data base with a direct hook-up between districts and the state.

This theme of accountability had two elements. The first was the use of formal

April 3, 1990

objective data for monitoring performance. "Hell yes," he said, "I look at data!" One of the innovations of which he was most proud was introducing quick basic facts tests to be taken by students every year in the elementary grades. When the opportunity arose, he hired a data-analysis oriented research person to replace his director of planning. The other element he stressed more than most educators was that people must measure up to expectations. Negative incentives were often used in the process. Thus, he was well known for publicizing the results of his basic facts tests in the newspaper to get improvement:

I publish test scores in the paper. _____ is principal of Winnetka with its elitist, old-time Mossville money. Two years ago, his school was fourteenth in the district on the basic skills test. Parents came in and asked him why. Now his school is second.

He also pushed the board to not give tenure to inadequate beginning teachers and to remove inadequate principals, efforts in which he was often unsuccessful. The highly formalized, scientific-looking evaluation system that was at the core of the career ladder and the linkage of incentives to objective performance both fit his vision.

In Smalltown, Dr. Brahmin had an elaborate process vision that reflected the need to work with different constituency groups within the district. His frequently repeated admonition about shared governance was that "there are four groups in the district with veto power. They all have to like something to make it work. These groups are the board, the principals, the teachers, and the superintendent." He was especially sensitive to the needs of the board:

The care and feeding of the Board is the superintendent's most important task. My leverage in the district stems from their belief that "he has control of the board."

This does not mean that he was subservient to the board. In his first months

April 3, 1990

in office, he took on the drivers' education challenge which had polarized the community for 6 months. Much like Babe Ruth pointing past the right field fence before he hit a home run, Dr. Brahmin told his administrators he would get a 9-0 vote on this issue where the board was had been split 5-4. Doing so raised his internal credibility considerably.

If Dr. Brahmin was sensitive to the board, he also reached out in other directions. He described how

"I brought about a quarter of the 400 teachers into the district here to sit on that couch. I go over the history of the district with them. I do it as a historical interview... They find it puzzling that I'm asking not telling.

At the same time that he responded to board needs, a teachers' association militant could say that "his stress is cooperation with the union." Thus, he appeared to reach out and consult with all groups.

While asking and listening, he slowly, but continuously moved people towards his view of shared governance. If at times he was controlling, it was because he saw pitfalls he wanted to avoid:

I saw [the first meeting of the senate] as an exercise in atmospherics. I was embarrassed that it was me talking for 90 minutes....I had no alternative because these people only talk through their union. If I'd asked the 18 [elected teachers] what was on their mind, they'd have frozen. They met before and planned what they'd say. [A teachers' association official's] questions were scripted. Its pragmatic. Also there are historic memories of reprisals.... I knew it wouldn't be a free flowing discussion. I know the danger of having 20 minutes left and then asking for questions.

Dr. Brahmin also had a content vision of curricular changes he wanted to introduce and new roles he wanted teachers to play. In the early days, this vision was reflected in his efforts to get the staff to agree on master teachers and a peer assistance council, but he generally made this content

April 3, 1990

vision subservient to his process concerns.

In contrast to Dr. Brahmin, Dr. Wise' vision emphasized content concerns.

In recalling his interviews for the job in Desert Flats, he said,

my interests were in curriculum and instruction. They seemed interested in that approach. I'm interested in leadership of principals as instructional catalysts. I wanted fairly intensive training of principals. Instructional observation and analysis. Stimulating feedback from principals to teachers.

If his vision was not as technocratic as Dr. O'Brien's, it still had strong centralizing tendencies, relying heavily on principal leadership for pedagogy as described above district curriculum coordination:

I created an assistant superintendent for curriculum and instruction. It was the second most important position in the district. I appointed [Dr. Friendly]... We tried to articulate the curriculum systematically over the years, a strand or two at a time...

Dr. Wise' process vision was not as controlling as Dr. O'Brien's. Instead it appeared underdeveloped. His recollection of his early years in the district is that "I should have done more interpersonal things. I get into ideas and don't give enough recognition and nurturing." With that orientation, he was relatively open to responding to strong opposition so he tempered his vision to respond to teacher concerns.

The source of process vision in Desert Flats was Dr. Friendly who had competed with Dr. Wise for the superintendency and took over when Dr. Wise left for a larger district.

[Dr. Wise] was distant and unapproachable. [Dr. Friendly] was the kind of person that anyone could walk into his office....[former supt.] was the old superintendent. He was surrounded by a group of administrators known as [supt.'s] boys...[Friendly] was [supt.'s] boy...Many of these programs started with [Wise] and continued with [Friendly]. We are much more forward thinking now.

[old superintendent] was the end of an era of longevity...But things had begun to change. They didn't want to repeat the Good Old Boy syndrome.

April 3, 1990

It came down to [Wise] and [Friendly]. It was a good decision for that particular time. It would have been hard for [Friendly] to make changes as a member of the Good Old Boys.

[Friendly] didn't bring things on, but he made them work. He said there were good ways to make them work. [Wise] brought the ideas. [Friendly] facilitated them. He helped with the process so they grew.

The superintendent's vision was crucial because the superintendent was crucial, at least in the eyes of teachers and board members. They attributed much of the direction and dynamism of these programs to the chief executive officer:

Dr. [Friendly] has been the most influential. Because he's committed, the principals are committed. Because the principals are committed the teachers are committed.

It's now beyond rhetoric and into real tangible action. Guided by the superintendent who is enlightened. The person most responsible is Dr. [Brahmin] The concept of shared governance is a decided strength. I can't think that any of it would have happened without Dr. [Brahmin].

The supt. [O'Brien] is the chief administrator, the educational leader of the district...As far as the system is concerned, it was the superintendent...He wanted to get in on the ground floor and shape the program the way he thought it should be.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF RESTRUCTURING

One might expect to find two immediate effects of restructuring reforms on teachers. First, such reforms should influence teachers' motivations and sentiments about their work. Much of the policy discussion of career ladders and related reforms has been in the context of recruiting and retaining bright, skilled people as teachers (Carnegie, 1986; Holmes, 1986). Second, these reforms might influence the kind and quality of teaching more directly. The effect emphasized and the particular kind of effect will depend, however, on whether the restructuring effort is professional or bureaucratic.

April 3, 1990

Sentiments and Motivations

While both the bureaucratic and professional visions of restructuring acknowledge the importance of recruiting and retaining effective personnel, the issue is of more concern to the latter. Because the professional approach gives more room to individual judgement and relies more on internalized ethical standards to control behavior (Weick & McDaniel, 1989), a committed, motivated staff is crucial.

As a rule that kind of commitment and motivation was created in Desert Flats. Teacher observations about the Desert Flats Career Ladder indicate a broad commitment both on the part of speakers and in what the speaker observes from others' behavior:

We finally have teachers in charge of what they should be. They volunteer and apply, so they have more enthusiasm. People have responsibility for something. Things are getting done more effectively. That takes us out of 'just the class' into a concern for the whole school. Before it was just the principal who had that concern. Now we all have concern for peers, kids and education as a whole.

We are more successful than others so we have had opportunities others haven't. [Association official]

For me the most important is I can see that the teachers are involved. They get involved with the latest information and get that to us. We are always informed. If I need help with math or social studies, they can give it to me. There is more work for them, but the benefits outweigh the costs.

The schools are run more effectively in [Desert Flats]. Teacher morale is up. There is respect among teachers as colleagues. The community has more respect for teachers.

In addition with a few exceptions, Desert Flats' teachers' perceptions about and acceptance of evaluation were notable and startling:

Evaluations? I love them. They are absolutely wonderful. Whoever it is who is doing them can walk in & observe. It's always positive. It's not a rip apart time & not demoralizing. It's helpful with

April 3, 1990

teaching. I can look at the writeups to help me.

We used to be afraid when the principal came in before. They are not as threatening now. For a teacher it's exhilarating. For the young ones it may be threatening, but when they hear it's support they like it more. They ask the administrator to come in and evaluate 'time on task' and other things... The evaluation is difficult, but we know what's expected. If we are not measuring up, we better know why. This is not a boss person coming in, but a support person coming in.

What appeared to make these evaluations so positive for the teachers was the perspective of the administrators about clinical supervision as a process. It was viewed as developmental and formative, as an opportunity to give positive messages about strengths and as a support system for weaknesses. Evaluations only became summative when a teacher's performance remained inadequate despite many efforts on the part of the administrator and lead teachers to assist in improvement.

Several teachers talked about how they asked the principal to use different evaluation instruments if they, themselves, wanted to assess an aspect of their performance that was not included in the standard assessment. One of those instruments evaluated teacher/student interactions. Another aspect of the evaluation system in the district was the use of lead teachers to work with beginning teachers. Lead teachers were assigned to new teachers to model lessons for them and to help them prepare for clinical supervision. Officially lead teachers' assessments were not used in the administrator evaluation process, giving new teachers some confidence that their problems would be between them and the teacher leader. While the evaluation system used in Desert Flats was similar in design to the system used in Mossville, the perspective used in its implementation appears to have made a substantial difference in its impact on teachers.

April 3, 1990

In spite of acceptance of the evaluation system, there was concern about the inequities created by the differentiation among positions especially when lead teachers and curriculum specialists were selected:

It has created some hurt feelings and resentment. Someone who had done a job for a long time was hurt when not asked.

The program problems for negotiation are divisiveness as people are selected and not selected. Cluster coordinators were added - that added 10 extra positions; but still some were in and some out. Some are murmuring.

We shied away from merit pay - felt it was real divisive. The legislature did not like that so we put in a bonus tied to writing.

A survey of Desert Flats teachers conducted by two university professors concluded that "the teachers rejected stability in favor of broad access;" that is they chose equal opportunity over hierarchy.

A final positive note is that Desert Flats teachers appreciated the financial reward they received, even though most felt it did not adequately reimburse them for the increased workload they experienced. One lead teacher felt that the stipend and pay for extra days only compensated him for 60% of the work that he did. However, most stated that they would not do the extra work without the extra pay.

In contrast, the net effect of Mossville's career ladder was to reduce teacher motivation. Here too, teachers did appreciate the increases in salary although not to the extent that administrators expected. In fact there was some ambivalence. Teachers who were not at level II saw the financial benefits as something for someone other than themselves. In addition, some of those who received extra-pay-for-extra-work assignments, like their colleagues in Desert Flats, found that the time demands outweighed the added income. They were not impressed by the new formal status system. As one teacher explained, "level II

April 3, 1990

won't earn them respect. If you were respected last year for your professional capacities, adding level II won't make a difference."

The potential benefits of the career ladder were offset by real costs. It increased the competition among teachers. They said:

It can add some competition and can add some frustration. Seeing the teacher next door do XYZ and one of you gets it and not the other.

Teachers feel there is competition. It used to be that everyone was on the same level, but when one makes level II and the other one doesn't, it makes a problem between them. Some level IIs used others to get where they are, so people now keep their ideas to themselves.

Teachers also complained about stress and pressure, saying, "We're frightened all the time. It has made good teachers neurotic. We are measurably more anxious than we used to be. It's our reality no matter how many times we are told not to be." Added paperwork contributed to this stress.

More important was concern about being observed in class:

For a lot, it's nerve wracking. It doesn't bother me because I did the pilot. When we did the reading pilot, I got used to people walking in. You're a little tense. When [the principal] walks in, I tighten up a little. I don't know why. I'm not generally uncomfortable with people in my classroom. It causes a lot of pressure.

Tension about the observations was related to the most pervasive teacher complaint: that the evaluation system was unfair. Teachers repeatedly cited inconsistencies among raters. In some buildings the principal was seen as providing fairer ratings; in others the OE was preferred. It was not just that individuals or roles differed but that the expertise of observers varied depending on the past work. Although the evaluation system was supposed to be applicable to any classroom, teachers believed that subject matter and student age made a difference, saying that "an English teacher can't judge a trig class, 'cause they don't know what to look for." Moreover, the data base for

April 3, 1990

making decisions was questioned. Both teachers and principals believed that some people "put on a show" for the three or four hours they were evaluated each year. Teachers also feared that administrators would misuse their authority. Some told stories about the use of the system to punish teachers, and others were equally disturbed about teachers who were promoted in spite of apparent deficits in instructional ability. The net effect was to create tension and distrust among teachers but especially between teachers and administrators.

As of the time of the fieldwork, Smalltown teachers' sentiments about shared governance were mixed. Several said:

I don't see any difference. We didn't share in helping to pick a new principal. We give suggestions and nothing is done. We still get orders from the top without our input.

The difference for regular classroom teachers has not been a whole lot. They have done curriculum development...The gripes are still there. And if anything is going to drown shared governance, it's that. They look at the fact that their gripes have not been addressed and they think it's not working.

Others were even more negative. One SPC member felt the program had "gone down the tubes." However, even though a meeting called by the association president to assess the progress of shared governance was expected to be volatile because of teachers' frustrations, at the meeting people discussed many positives as well. Most important, they still believed the list of problems that came out of the Senate meeting would receive a fair hearing from the Superintendent.

Teachers made contradictory statements about the extent to which they had been included in decision-making. Some talked about how they had expected to have more say in more decisions. They complained that decisions they had made, or needs they had expressed, had been ignored at the district level. Yet, some

April 3, 1990

important changes in communication and school environment were apparent:

Having the association formally included in the cabinet meetings facilitates communication. There are no misinterpretations, no third party communications....The SPC has allowed us to have a 'we' spirit, versus an 'I and you'. More people are involved and talking to each other.

The lines of communication have opened. The teachers feel free to come to us or [the building administrator]...The communication lines are really open, even teachers to teachers...There's good harmony.

Efforts to differentiate roles created some of the same strains as in Mossville although to a lesser extent because differentiation was less important in Smalltown. Teachers were extremely upset by the master teacher concept:

Master Teacher is the pea below the mattresses. Central administration wants teachers designated master teachers. It was themselves, building administrators, and teachers who were to come up with the lists. This building is high strung on this issue...We tried to tell [the principal] and [Brahmin] to drop this and do other things...Master Teacher conjures up images of the old merit pay plan. Teachers feel slighted if they are not on the list.

I have concerns about perceptions of master teachers and we're going to take new names to them. Research & Resource Articulators. The teachers remember something from before about merit pay.

One principal also told about teachers who wore t-shirts with "Unmaster Teacher" printed on them after the selections had been announced.

Teachers were involved in the effort to redesign the district's evaluation system so it would be more developmental and discriminating. Although the final results were not announced during field work the issue was so volatile that drafts of the plan the senate was developing were not allowed out of the session until the instrument was complete, and distribution was carefully controlled.

Instructional Effects

April 3, 1990

Bureaucratic and professional restructuring strategies should have opposite effects on teaching. Bureaucratic reforms should increase standardization along the lines of a scientifically based conception of what constitutes good teaching (Bacharach & Conley, 1989; Elmore, 1990). Since the professional vision emphasizes the use of informed judgement to adjust to local uncertainty, reforms incorporating that vision should lead to more diversity and variation in teaching approach.

Teachers in New Hanover came to conform to the teaching approach built into the teacher evaluation system at two levels. One was an increased awareness of what constitutes good teaching as defined by the system. Teachers said:

These processes have labels and you say, "Ooh! How can you do it all? When they look at your work, they point out where you do it. You say, "Oh, did I do that?" I didn't need a lot of help. It made me more cognizant.

The other was in improved techniques. These reflected aspects of the evaluation system. Some were specific items evaluated. Teachers particularly mentioned that they increased their "time-on-task" or amount of time given to instruction as a result of the new system and related training. Other comments referred to teachers' organization more generally. Teachers said, "the program made me better organized..." or "there's a focus. Its not hit or miss. There's a plan." Principals were if anything even more impressed with how the career ladder improved teaching than teachers, citing the same developments in improved time-on-task and organization.

The other side of the coin was teacher complaints that the evaluation system created rigidity. Teachers said,

It takes away individual style. Everybody is supposed to be the same.

April 3, 1990

There's a six-point lesson plan that they say we don't have to do, but the evaluation is based on it so how can you get around it.

or more generally that, "Its insidiously and gradually stifling individual style." Comments like these suggest that the evaluation system promoted a style of teaching that was not always appropriate and thus reduced teacher judgement.

The Desert Flats program created an enriched curriculum, with many more curricular, material and instructional resources than would have been possible otherwise in the financially troubled district. The effects are summarized by this teacher, whose remarks echo those of many others:

What is provided in the curriculum has been boosted 400%. It has magnified individual effects. The materials are better. Principals couldn't do everything...It initiated a lot of programs to help the beginning teacher...I feel like because we've had so much input we've had an opportunity to develop skills we may not have had in the past. It has opened the door for more professional opportunities for everyone...Those kind of things. Units have been developed. Volunteers have gone out for donations. It has increased what we have at the school.

The curriculum of the schools and the district was broadly diversified by the efforts of curriculum specialists, with new art, music, computer, science, cooperative learning, non-selective enrichment, and other programs.

Each school was granted a number of specialist positions based on school population. Only certain curricular areas were specifically required by the district; the rest could be determined at the school, with faculties and administrators deciding which areas were most appropriate. One school instituted a gifted and talented program that had an enrichment component for the entire school, and related classroom activities for each class. Students self-selected to do significant projects related to a specific topic, as their interests and talents directed. This school had a curriculum specialist whose

April 3, 1990

assignment was to develop the topics and oversee classroom and individual projects. Another area some schools addressed was the development of cooperative learning.

New teachers received assistance with instructional needs from experienced lead teachers, and assistance with curricular needs from curriculum specialists whose job was to produce lesson plans and curricular materials. In addition, real improvements in teacher performance were noted. One parent explained that her child was in a class that two years before she would have done everything possible to get the child out of because the teacher had been so poor. However, by working with the administrator and the teachers on the career ladder, the teacher had become an effective instructor. The professional talents of teachers were used and developed, creating more resources and materials for all teachers, and improved performance for many teachers.

Since Smalltown's restructuring focused primarily on a new governance system and that had not had time to make substantial decisions during the period of intense field work, it was difficult to identify effects on teaching in that district. However, when asked about its possible effects on classroom teaching, teachers generally felt that the improved spirit and communication had to impact on the classroom. When teachers feel happier, they said, it shows in their teaching and that has to have an effect on the students. The important mechanism in substantially improving or failing to improve instruction will be the implementation of the evaluation system that the working group has developed.

CONCLUSION

Reforms in Mossville, Smalltown and Desert Flats were responses to a

April 3, 1990

perceived need to restructure teaching. Mossville and Desert Flats implemented state career ladders that were legislated to attract and retain good teachers. Smalltown's program was a local effort to include teachers in decisionmaking. Both the Mossville and Desert Flats programs generated teacher opposition that was communicated to the board. In Desert Flats the superintendent, following the board's direction, changed his approach and included teachers more in decision-making. Doing so turned the program in a more professional direction. The superintendent in Mossville resisted pressures to change course and continued with his bureaucratic reform. In both cases, the direction taken was reinforced by the number two administrator, but the direction taken was quite different.

Smalltown's reform history was much less conflictive. The point was to bring the association into the decision-making loop and avoid past friction. As a result, the association leadership took on some of the peacemaking and bridge-building functions that Desert Flats' number two administrator did. Here too, teacher involvement moved the reform in its professional direction. However, the superintendent's desire to maintain control over the process meant that it retained a bureaucratic component.

Although all three districts purported to "restructure" teaching, their agendas were quite different. In Desert Flats where teacher participation and development became a goal, the program went in a professional direction that increased motivation, built collegiality, and broadened the curriculum. In Mossville, where the control and management of teachers was fundamental, the program went in a bureaucratic direction that reduced motivation and collegiality and standardized instruction. In Smalltown teacher participation

April 3, 1990

and development was the goal, but control and management of the program was also desired. The program has proceeded professionally at the building level, but more bureaucratically at the district level. Changes in teacher motivation and collegiality have been modest, and the program has not yet progressed far enough to assess curricular and instructional outcomes.

These cases suggest some conclusions on both the meaning of restructuring and how it is shaped. The magnitude of change and direction are two aspects of restructuring that are central to the dialogue about this reform. Magnitude refers to the quantity of change that must exist for restructuring to truly be present. If there is any consensus on what restructuring is, it is that the changes involved are large and fundamental. These cases illustrate that some restructuring efforts are larger than others. There may even be some question as to whether all of them are substantial enough to be considered restructuring. This is something of a definitional issue.

Direction is also an important issue. In spite of the rhetoric emphasizing the professionalization of teaching, restructuring has developed in two directions. The professional one accepts that many teachers have energy and talents that can contribute positively towards improving the curricular and instructional programs of the school. Professionalism also assumes that teaching is a field with substantial uncertainty, a constructive process where judgement and tacit-knowledge must supplement formal knowledge if any but the most formal instructional objectives are to be met. Thus, professional restructuring efforts rely on teachers' judgement, include them in decision making, provide opportunities for advancement and for job variety, and build collegial interaction.

April 3, 1990

The bureaucratic view of teaching suggests that the problems teachers face are readily analyzable, and a finite array of solutions are available. Even if there is no one best way, teaching approaches can be matched to conditions using contingency theories. Bureaucratic views of teaching emphasize top-down imposition of change, standardization of instruction, extrinsic rewards, and deemphasis of teacher judgement.

Program outcomes depend on the direction taken. Bureaucratic reforms reduce teacher motivation and create dissention, competition, and stress. Teaching becomes more standardized. Attempts to alleviate these stresses will have little impact. Professional reforms give teachers satisfaction with their inclusion in decision making and motivate them to participate through financial means and by offering opportunities to develop professionally. Curriculum will be more diversified, and new teachers may receive more adequate assistance. Mixed programs, as in Smalltown, will have mixed results.

To complicate matters, it is important to recognize that restructuring may lead to results that are the opposite of the reformers' intent, especially if the goal is to increase professionalization, but the means actually decrease it, or if the means conflict with teachers' concerns and norms. To avoid such confusion, it is important to clarify the design elements that promote professionalization or bureaucratization. These include such elements as authority and autonomy, collegiality, rank and remuneration, changed tasks, and changed organizational form. The form these elements take determine in great part whether restructuring is professional or bureaucratic.

One crucial design issue is how teachers positions are differentiated. Any move in the direction of merit pay violates teacher norms of equality,

April 3, 1990

especially where they feel that it is not possible to make accurate judgments about what makes one teacher 'better' than another. As a result, merit pay requires bureaucratic imposition. While Mossville's ladder included some components of job enlargement, it was largely a merit pay design that enhanced the bureaucratic element. Attempts to impose it were strongly resisted.

On the other hand, job enlargement allows teachers opportunities for task variety, and to develop skills and share information. Where assignments are controlled by teachers themselves as knowledgeable professionals they are better accepted by colleagues. Opportunities for influence and to provide training and assistance are distributed differentially according to one's knowledge. Desert Flats' largely job enlargement design, with teachers integral to the selection process, moved the district towards professionalization. In addition, job enlargement does not violate teacher norms of equality because teachers are paid for doing more, not just for being 'better.' Designs that incorporate job enlargement, such as Desert Flats career ladder meet with less resistance, allowing for collaborative implementation.

In some cases, professional restructuring may not be the goal. Popkewitz and Lind (1988) found that reform rhetoric on professional restructuring concealed a reduction of teacher autonomy and responsibility through increased standardization. Mossville's evaluation system had just these effects. Teacher resistance to standardization was so strong that new techniques were introduced that would widen discretion but still satisfy the evaluation. While Desert Flats evaluation instrument was similar in philosophy to that used in Mossville, its application was much less rigid, with more room for discretion

April 3, 1990

and judgement of both teachers in their lessons and administrators in their evaluations. The inclusion of teachers in the development process is probably the key factor promoting discretion.

Program design stems from complex renegotiation of the "contract" among several parties. The outcome of that political negotiation, the professional or bureaucratic direction of the program, will depend partly on interests--of the board and of the teachers--and on structural elements like the strength of the teachers association but also on the strength of particular parties.

The state affects the negotiation and the subsequent direction of the program by the funds it makes available and the conditions placed on the use of those funds which structure much of the subsequent dialogue. Highly prescriptive guidelines set the stage for bureaucratic implementation while those that allow more local discretion encourage professionalization. Yet, this influence is not one way. District leaders can influence state policy, as happened in both Mossville and Desert Flats.

The board is integral to the process of restructuring. Board discontent can lead to a restructuring effort although in these cases it did so indirectly. These boards varied in the level of discontent from Smalltown which faced a true crisis situation, to Desert Flats where the board felt a vague sense of unease that a good district was stagnating for lack of new ideas and vision.

The board's influence is exercised primarily through its choice of superintendents. Once that person is functioning in the district and has displayed a capability to respond to board concerns, it will largely defer to his vision as long as problems do not arise, and trust the superintendent to

April 3, 1990

move the program forward. Board support may depend on the progress of restructuring, but other unrelated factors may be more important, since superintendents are generalists whose backing from the board depends on their handling of many issues. The board may also back the superintendent with additional financial support. This financial support could have critical importance for the magnitude of the program. If problems arise with teachers in response to the program, the board may press the superintendent to solve them in ways that respond to teachers' needs. When problems arise between the board and superintendent, the board has limited capacity to change the decisions of an unyielding chief executive short of firing that person.

The position and strength of the teachers' association also affects program direction, as will the ways that the program addresses or fails to address teachers' interests. While Mossville teachers generally opposed the career ladder, they were largely impotent because they lacked bargaining power with the local board. In Desert Flats and Smalltown, the associations had collective bargaining rights, and were well positioned to influence both design and process. In Smalltown particularly, the association regional service representative had become crucial to any district decisions that involved teachers.

The superintendent's role is pivotal--since he or she is in contact with all the parties--but not totally determining. In these districts, the superintendent or a top administrator close to the superintendent initiated the restructuring effort. The superintendent can, and usually does, set the tone of the change. When the superintendent responds to teachers' interests in planning, implementation, and problem solving, as in Desert Flats, a

April 3, 1990

professional direction results. When the superintendent ignores teachers' interests and maintains control over those functions or delegates them to one person, bureaucratization increases; this happened in Mossville. Smalltown's combination of teacher participation in some areas but superintendent control over others created a direction somewhere in between the two. However, the superintendent can also be gone around as happened in both Mossville and Desert Flats. Unless there is board and teacher support, the programs will wither on the vine.

The nature of alliance building is also important to the direction of restructuring. Where teachers, the board and the superintendent work together, the reform develops professionally. Where alliances with teachers are dismissed or underutilized, the reforms develop bureaucratically, as happened in Mossville.

Design and process are integrally intertwined in restructuring programs. Where the process is inclusionary--whether because of administrative orientation, board concern, teacher power, or state regulation--the restructuring design will be more professional and teachers are likely to be more committed. Where teachers are cut out of the process that is heavily structured by state policy or controlled by district leaders, the design is likely to be more bureaucratic and demotivating, and teaching will become more standardized.

April 3, 1990

REFERENCES

- Bacharach, S.B. & Conley, S.C. (1989). Uncertainty and decisionmaking in teaching: Implications for managing line professionals. In T.J. Sergiovanni & J.H. Moore (Eds.), Schooling for tomorrow: Directing reforms to issues that count, 312-328. Boston, MA: Allyn And Bacon.
- Bacharach, S.B. & Lawler, E.J. (1980). Power and Politics in Organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bacharach, S.B. & Mitchell, S.M. (1987). The generation of practical theory: schools as political organizations. In J.W. Lorsch (Ed.), Handbook of Organizational Behavior, (pp. 405-418). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Bacharach, S.B. & Mitchell, S.M. (1981). Interest group politics in school districts: The case of local teachers' unions. In S.B. Bacharach (Ed.), Organizational behavior in schools and school districts. NY: Praeger Publishers.
- Baldrige, J.V. (1971). Power and conflict in the university. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Blase, J.J. (1989). Teachers' political orientation vis-a-vis the principal: the micropolitics of the school. In J. Hannaway and R. Crowson (Eds.), The Politics of Reforming School Administration: The 1988 Yearbook of the Politics of Education Association, pp. 113-126. New York: The Falmer Press.
- Burlingame, M. (1988). The politics of education and educational policy: The local level. In N.J. Boyan (Ed.), Handbook of research on educational administration (pp. 439-452). New York: Longman.
- Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.
- Cohen, M. (1989a). Foreword to David, J.L., Restructuring in progress: Lessons from pioneering districts.
- Cohen, M. (1988b). Restructuring the education system: Agenda for the 1990s. Washington, DC: National Governors' Association.
- Cuban, L. (1989). The district superintendent and the restructuring of schools: A realistic appraisal. In T. Sergiovanni & J.H. Moore (Eds.), Schooling for tomorrow: Directing reforms to issues that count. Boston, MA: Allyn And Bacon.
- David, J.L. (1989). Restructuring in progress: Lessons from pioneering districts. Washington, DC: National Governors' Association.

April 3, 1990

- Elmore, R.F. (1990). Introduction: On changing the structure of public schools. In Elmore, R.F. (Ed.), Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Firestone, W.A. (1977). Participation and influence in the planning of educational change. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 13, 167-183.
- Firestone, W.A., Fuhrman, S.H., & Kirst, M.W. (1989, October). The progress of reform: An appraisal of state education initiatives. CPRE Research Report Series, The State University of New Jersey, New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Policy Research in Education.)
- Fuhrman, S.H., Clune, W., & Elmore, R.F. (1988). Research on Educational Reform: lessons on the implementation of policy. In Yearbook of the American Educational Finance Association. Cambridge, MA: Ballenger.
- Ginsberg, R. & Wimpelberg, R.K. (1987). Educational change by commission: Attempting "trickle down" reform, Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis 2(4), 344-360.
- Guthrie, J.W. (1986, December). School-based management: The next needed education reform," Phi Delta Kappan, 305-309.
- Holmes Group, Inc. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers. A report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing, MI: Author.
- Johnson, S. M. (1989). Schoolwork and its reform. In J. Hannaway and R. Crowson (Eds.). The Politics of Reforming School Administration: The 1988 Yearbook of the Politics of Education Association, pp. 95-112. New York: Falmer Press.
- Johnson, S. M. (1990). Redesigning teachers' work. In Elmore, R.F. (Ed.). Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Lanier, J.E. & Sedlak, M.W. (1989). Teacher efficacy and quality schooling. In T.J. Sergiovanni & J.H. Moore (Eds.), Schooling for tomorrow: Directing reforms to issues that count, (pp. 119-131). Boston, MA: Allyn And Bacon.
- Little, J.W. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. American Educational Research Journal, 19, 325-340.
- Lortie, D.C. (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

April 3, 1990

- Malen, B. & Hart, A.W. (1987). Career ladder reform: A multi-level analysis of initial efforts. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 9, 9-23.
- Mintzberg, H. (1983). Structure in fives: Designing effective organizations. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Mowday, R.T., Porter, L.W. & Steers, R.M. (1982). Employee-organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover. New York: Academic Press.
- Morgan, G. (1986). Images of organization. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Nadler, D.A. (1987). The effective management of organizational change. In J.W. Lorsch (Ed.), Handbook of organizational behavior, (pp. 358-370). NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- National Association of State Boards of Education (n.d.). Today's children, tomorrow's survival: A call to restructure schools. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- National Governors Association. (1986). Time for results: The governors' 1991 report on education. Washington, DC: Author.
- National School Boards' Association (1990). Summit conference on the school board's role in education for the 1990s. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Olson, L. (1988). The "restructuring" puzzle: Ideas for revamping "egg-crate" schools abound, but to what end? Education Week, November 2, 1988.
- Popkewitz, T.S. & Lind, K. (1988). Teacher incentives as reforms: Teachers' work and the changing control mechanism in education. Teachers College Record, 90 (4), 575-594.
- Ranson, S., Hinings, B., & Greenwood, R. (1980, March). The structuring of organizational structures. Administrative Science Quarterly, 25 (1), 1-17.
- Rosenholtz, S.J. (1985, January). Political myths about education reform: Lessons from research on teaching. Phi Delta Kappan, 66 (5), 349-355.
- Schon, D.A. (1989). Professional knowledge and reflective practice. In T.J. Sergiovanni & J.H. Moore (Eds.), Schooling for tomorrow: Directing reforms to issues that count, (pp. 188-194). Boston, MA: Allyn And Bacon.
- Selznick, P. (1957). Leadership in administration: A sociological interpretation. New York: Harper & Row.

April 3, 1990

Shulman, L.S. (1989). Teaching alone, learning together: Needed agendas for the new reforms. In T.J. Sergiovanni & J.H. Moore (Eds.), Schooling for tomorrow: Directing reforms to issues that count, (pp. 167-186). Boston, MA: Allyn And Bacon.

Tyack, D. (1974). The One Best System. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Walker, R. (1990). Single definition of 'restructuring' remains elusive. Education Week, Volume IX (22), February 21, 1990, p. 15.

Weick, K.E. & McDaniel, R.R. (1989). How Professional Organizations Work: Implications for School Organization and Management. In T.J. Sergiovanni & J.H. Moore (Eds.), Schooling for Tomorrow: Directing Reforms to Issues That Count, pp. 331-354. Boston, MA: Allyn And Bacon.

Wise, A.E. (1979). Legislated learning: The bureaucratization of the American classroom. Berkeley: University of California Press.